



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/023,401	02/12/1998	GARY S. JACOB	SRL 6067	6896

321 7590 07/16/2002

SENNIGER POWERS LEAVITT AND ROEDEL
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
16TH FLOOR
ST LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/023,401

Applicant(s)
Jacob et al

Examiner
Russell Travers

Art Unit
1617



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 2, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 36-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 and 36-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 9 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

The information disclosure statement filed April 2, 2002 has been received and entered into the file. Unfortunately, no references were submitted with this disclosure, thus, Examiner will not be able to consider such disclosure.

The amendment filed April 2, 2002 has been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed April 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claims 1-34 and 36-73 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

Art Unit:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines an "antiviral compound".

Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "antiviral compound" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "antiviral compound(s)", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Art Unit:

Claims 1-19, 22-31, 36-54 and 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claims 1-19, 22-31, 36-54 and 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-19, 22-31, 36-54 and 58-66 are rendered indefinite by the phrase "antiviral compound" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining medicaments that fall under the "antiviral compound" penumbra are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Applicant's term fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 36-40, 43-45 and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Westarp et al.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 36-40, 43-45 and 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Chang et al.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-34 and 36-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Block et al, Repp et al, Applicants' admissions on the record and Gish et al.

Block et al, Repp et al and Gish et al teach, and Applicants admit on the record the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicaments are

Art Unit:

taught as useful for treating Hepatitis infections. Claims 1-34, 41-42, 46-47 and 52-73, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments,
- 2) administration levels of the medicaments, and
- 3) Specific compounds herein claimed.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of two conventional anti-inflammatory agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Claims herein recited require specific dosage levels. Determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Thus the only issue presented in the instant application is the obviousness of the claimed antiviral methods.

Art Unit:

The skilled artisan, possessing a compound for a therapeutic use possesses that compounds analogs, homologs, isomers, bioisosteres, salts, acids and esters for the same use. To employ an analog, homolog, isomer, bioisostere, salts acid and ester for the same use therapeutic use would have been obvious to the skilled artisan. Prior art use for the same therapeutic purpose would have motivated the skilled artisan to employ N-alkyl derivatives of deoxynojirmycin (as specifically taught by Block et al , Column 1, paragraph 1) for treating hepatitis and enjoy a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success. Block et al specifically claim 6 carbon alkyl compounds, with the disclosure teaching alky generally. Additionally, Applicants teach those alkyl compounds herein claimed as old and well known.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments presented to rebut the rejection under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs filed April 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Those presented claims are directed to "antiviral compounds" not a class of compounds, as constructively argued by Applicants. Based on the instant disclosure, the skilled artisan would have no problem identifying those compounds falling into the classes of nucleotide, or nucleosides envisioned by Applicants, yet the burden of identifying those compounds possessing "antiviral" activity would fall to those practicing the **invention as claimed**. Examiner must read the

Art Unit:

invention **as claimed**, not as envisioned by Applicant. Additionally, Examiner can not read limitations from the specification into the claims as presented. Absent some guidance directing the skilled artisan to those compounds possessing the desired "antiviral" activity, the instant claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs.

Applicant's attention is drawn to In re Dillon, 16 USPQ2nd 1897 at 1900 (CAFC 1990). The court sitting in banc ruled that the recitation of a new utility for an old and well known composition does not render that composition new. Thus, recitation of intended use fails to distinguish old and well known therapeutic compositions. Additionally, determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Thus, the only issue presented in the instant application is the obviousness of the claimed antiviral compositions and methods of use.

Attention is directed to Gish et al teaching those compounds herein claimed as useful for treating hepatic diseases possessing a viral etiology. As stated above, it is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows

Art Unit:

logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of two conventional anti-inflammatory agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Applicants aver unexpected benefits residing in the claimed subject matter, yet fail to set forth evidence substantiating this belief. Evidence as to unexpected benefits must be "clear and convincing" *In re Lohr*, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1963), and be of a scope reasonably commensurate with the scope of the subject matter claimed, *In re Linder*, 173 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1972). The data provided by Applicants is not reasonably commensurate in scope with the instant claims. Absent claims commensurate with the showing of unexpected benefits, or a showing reasonably commensurate with the instant claims, such claims remain properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

It is well known by the skilled artisan that carriers and excipients are employed to enhance the activity of active ingredients. Thus, the skilled artisan would expect conventional excipients and carriers to be useful concomitantly, absent information to the contrary. The instant carriers and excipients are not employed concomitantly in the prior art, thus only obviate their concomitant use.

Art Unit:

Applicant's attention is drawn to In re Graf, 145 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1965) and In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530 (CCPA 1971) where the court ruled that when a substance is unpatentable under 35 USC 103, it is immaterial that applicant may have disclosed an obvious or unobvious further purpose or advantage for the substance.

Examiner would favorably consider claims directed to those medicaments providing unexpected therapeutic benefits, as averred herein.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY

Art Unit:

PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE
OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell
Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Travers', with a horizontal line drawn through the middle of the signature.

Russell Travers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617